REMARKS

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamada (U.S. Patent 6,008,440) in view of Ciani (U.S. Patent EP 0711655) further in view of *Mass, Weight, Density, or Specific Gravity of Wood* (hereinafter known as Si_Wood). In light of the below remarks, consideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 have been rejected under § 103 over Yamada in view of Ciani and further in view of Si_Wood. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 requires "the thermal pressing being conducted by controlling a pressure so that a density of the laminated bodies is in the range from 0.8 to 1.4 g/cm^3 and a thickness of the laminated bodies is less that 20mm." Independent claims 5, 10 and 12 have the same density limitations. None of the prior art references of record teach or suggest this limitation.

In rejecting this limitation, the Office Action at pages 3-4 provide a sample calculation based on example 1 contained in Ciani. For this example, the Office Action has chosen to use ash wood in its example and has used the density of solid ash from the Si_Wood reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the example contained in the Office Action is relevant to the present invention. It is noted that Ciani itself is silent with respect to the density of its final laminate products. Specifically, in the example used in the Office Action, the density of the laminated body of Ciani is calculated using the density calculations for a solid wood. Significantly, the example does not take into account the effects of the resin required to create the laminated body. The example merely calculates the thickness of 14 layers of ash wood before compression, divides that by the thickness of the laminated body after compression and multiplies that by the density of ash wood before compression to purportedly obtain the density of the compressed body in Ciani.

Applicants respectfully disagree that this is a valid methodology. In making this calculation, the Office Action does not account for several things, such as: the presence of resin; the

6

density of the resin; the compression of the resin; and the change in overall area of the laminated body due to compression.

The calculation contained in the Office Action assumes that the area of the laminated body stays constant as it is compressed. However, density is a measure of volume, not just this thickness. As a laminated body is compressed, both the length and the width of the laminated body changes with compression. The assumption that the area of the laminated body stays constant as used in the calculation is therefore erroneous. Further, the calculation does not take into account the effect of the resin on the density of the laminated body.

As the calculation used in the Office Action is flawed in its methodology, its use in the rejection of the claims of the present application is improper and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As none of the prior art references of record teach the density limitation as expressly required by each of the independent claims of the present application, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

As each of the claims of the present application are currently in condition for allowance such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: August 21, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael J. Scheer/
Michael J. Scheer
  Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
2049 Century Park East, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 772-8364
Attorney for Applicant